

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated September 25, 2006
Reply to the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Applicants are grateful to the Examiner for conducting the personal interview between the Examiner and Applicant's representative on September 19, 2006. The Amendments provided herein reflect the proposed Amendments presented to the Examiner during the personal interview.

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-69 are pending in the application. Claims 20, 33-35, 39-40, 42, 45, 47, 49, 50, and 57-60 have been amended. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

II. Rejection under 35 USC §112

Claims 34-41, 45-54, 56, and 64-69 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as allegedly failing to meet the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner has alleged that various features that are presently recited in the claims are not supported by the specification. Accordingly, in the remarks that follow Applicant respectfully points out where each feature is supported in the specification.

A. Claims 34 and 39-41

First, the Examiner has asserted that the language "displaying a second image that is received from a device external to the video display apparatus on the screen; modifying OSD data corresponding to the first image including the OSD with respect to a position of the rotatable screen when the screen is rotated; and displaying the first image that corresponds to the modified OSD data on the second image displayed on the rotatable screen" lacks support from the specification. See Final Office Action of June 6, 2006 page 3.

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated September 25, 2006
Reply to the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006

However, as pointed out during the interview, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to (1) the OSD 1104 in FIG. 10 and (2) the language at column 3, lines 51-56 and column 4, lines 6-9 "a display panel...for displaying a picture of externally inputted R-G-B video signals" and "an OSD...generator 700 for receiving horizontal/vertical synchronizing signals and clock signals 601 from an outside source, and for outputting first R-G-B signals 701 in response to OSD control signals 210." This cited language describes FIG. 3 of Applicant's specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that "the externally inputted R-G-B video signals" described at column 3, lines 51-56 corresponds to "receiving an externally input video signal having a second image," as presently recited in independent claim 34 of Applicant's invention. Additionally, the OSD 1104 of FIG. 10, which corresponds to the first R-G-B signals described at column 4, lines 6-9 of Applicant's specification corresponds to "a first image including an on-screen display (OSD)," as presently recited in independent claim 34. One of ordinary skill in the art would readily appreciate that the OSD 1104 (i.e., the first image) would be displayed on the image that corresponds to the "externally inputted R-G-B video signals" (i.e., the second image) to be displayed by the display panel 1100. Moreover, this description and illustration of the present invention would convey to one of ordinary skill in the art that Applicant was in possession of the claimed invention, as presently recited in independent claims 34, 39, and 40, at the time the application was filed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification provides support for all of the features as claimed in independent claims 34, 39, and 40 and therefore, Applicant has satisfied the written description requirement of §112 with respect to these claims.

B. Claims 35, 45, and 46

The Examiner has also asserted that the language "display the OSD image containing information about operation of the screen body at a rotated position in accordance with the mode signal" lacks support from Applicant's specification. See Final Office Action of June 6, 2006, page 3.

However, as pointed out during the interview, Applicant respectfully points out that this feature is shown in FIGS. 1-2 and described at column 1, lines 14-19 and column 3, lines 25-30

of Applicant's specification. These portions of Applicant's specification disclose that the OSD can contain, among other things, information that the user can use to "arbitrarily adjust the brightness and size of the picture" and that the OSD function is carried out on a screen when the user manipulates a function key of a key pad 15 disposed on a screen body. This description of adjusting the brightness and the size of the picture by selecting the function keys to generate the OSD clearly refers to displaying "information about operation of the screen body," as presently recited in independent claim 35 of Applicant's invention. For example, according to the above-cited portion of the specification, "the information about operation of the screen body" can include a brightness of the screen body or the size of the picture displayed on the screen body, among other things. Based on this description, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have realized that Applicant was in possession of an apparatus that displays an "OSD image containing information about operation of the screen body," as presently recited in independent claim 35 of Applicants' invention. Independent claim 45 recites a similar feature, which is also supported by Applicant's specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification provides support for all of the features as claimed in independent claims 35 and 45, and therefore, Applicant has satisfied the written description requirement of §112 with respect to these claims.

C. Claims 36-38 and 64-66

The Examiner has also alleges that the language "OSD window" or "control window" lacks support from Applicant's invention. See Final Office Action of June 6, 2006, page 3. However, as pointed out during the interview, Applicant respectfully points out that this feature is clearly shown in FIGS. 1, 2, 6, 7, and 10 of Applicant's specification. For example, the OSD 1104 shown in FIG. 10 is clearly a "window" displayed on the "SCREEN." Furthermore, the term "OSD window" is a well know phrase used in the art, and well known to those of ordinary skill in the art. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have realized that Applicant was in possession of an apparatus that displays an "OSD window," as presently recited in independent claim 36 of Applicant's invention and/or "a control window," as presently recited in claims 64-66. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification provides support for all of the features as claimed in independent claim 36 and

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated September 25, 2006
Reply to the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006

therefore, Applicant has satisfied the written description requirement of §112 with respect to claims 36-38 and 64-66.

D. Claims 47-54 and 56

Next, the Examiner asserts that the language "function keys" or "screen function keys" appearing in claims 47-54 and 56 lacks support from Applicant's specification. See Final Office Action of June 6, 2006, page 3.

However, Applicant first respectfully notes that neither the language "function keys" nor "screen function keys" appears in independent claim 52. Thus, this rejection of independent claim 52 is improper.

Additionally, as pointed out during the interview, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to the first paragraph of the detailed description section at column 3, lines 25-30, which clearly describes a key pad 15 having function keys shown in FIGS. 1 and 2. Applicant further points out that the key pad 1105 shown in FIG. 10 is described at column 6, lines 10-15 of Applicant's specification. Based on this description, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have realized that Applicant was in possession of a video display apparatus having "function keys" and/or "screen function keys," as recited in claims 47-51, 53, 54, and 56 of Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification provides support for all of the features relating to "function keys" or "screen function keys," as claimed, and therefore, Applicant has satisfied the written description requirement of §112 with respect to claims 47-51, 53, 54, and 56.

E. Claims 67-69

Finally, the Examiner alleges that the features "OSD indicates screen viewing settings comprising at least one of a brightness of a screen picture affecting the displayed second image and a size of the screen picture affecting the displayed second image" is not supported by Applicant's specification. See Final Office Action of June 6, 2006, page 3.

Again, as pointed out during the interview, Applicant respectfully points out that this feature is described at column 1, lines 14-19 and column 3, lines 25-30 of Applicant's specification. These portions of Applicant's specification disclose that the OSD can contain,

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated September 25, 2006
Reply to the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006

among other things, information that the user can use to "arbitrarily adjust the brightness and size of the picture" and that the OSD function is carried out on a screen when the user manipulates a function key of a key pad 15 disposed on a screen body 11. Based on this description, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would realize that Applicant was in possession of an apparatus having an OSD that indicates "screen viewing settings comprising at least one of a brightness of a screen picture affecting the displayed second image and a size of the screen picture affecting the displayed second image," as presently recited in claims 67-69 of Applicant's invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification provides support for all of the features as claimed in independent claims 67-69, and therefore, Applicant has satisfied the written description requirement of §112 with respect to these claims.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all the features presently recited in the pending claims are supported by Applicant's originally filed specification. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection based on §112 be withdrawn.

III. Rejection under 35 USC §102 based on Register

Claims 20-29, 32-33 and 47-51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,661,632 to Register. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

A. Claims 20-29

Applicant respectfully submits that Register fails to disclose, among other things, "displaying a picture of externally inputted color component video signals on the screen body and displaying the OSD image on the displayed picture, the OSD image containing information about operation of the screen at a rotated position in accordance with the mode signal," as presently recited in independent claim 20 of Applicant's invention.

Register is directed to a handheld computer apparatus (e.g., a PDA) that rotates an image being displayed on a screen according to a user input. See Register, col. 1, lines 39-49. FIGS. 4 and 5 of Register show an image displayed on a display screen 26 "DISPLAY SCREEN

IMAGE" and command icons 54a and 54b displayed around a border of the display screen 26. However, Register does not disclose (1) "displaying a picture of externally inputted color component video signals" and (2) "displaying the OSD image on the displayed picture," as presently recited in independent claim 20.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the...claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). "The elements must be arranged as required by the claim..." In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Further, in the event that the Office Action is relying on the theory of inherency in any manner, "the Examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied art." Ex parte Levy, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) (emphasis in original). See also MPEP 2112. Accordingly, since Register does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 20, Register cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 20 is allowable over Register, and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Regarding claims 21-30 and 32, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reasons that each of claims 21-30 and 32 depends from independent claim 20, and therefore contain each of the features as presently recited in this claim, claims 21-30 and 32 are therefore also patentable over Register. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is also earnestly solicited.

B. Claim 33

At page 7 of the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006, the Examiner alleges that Register's command icons 54a and 54b can be interpreted as Applicant's "OSD window." However, Applicant's respectfully submit that Register's command icons 54a and 54b do not "indicate[s] attribute information about an operational state of the screen body," as presently recited in

Independent claim 33 of Applicant's invention.

Register's command icons 54s and 54b indicate commands around the border of the display screen 26 and can be selected by corresponding ones of the control buttons 28, 30, 32, and 34. See Register FIGS. 4 to 5 and col. 3, lines 33-48. However, in contrast with the present invention, FIGS. 4 and 5 of Register show that the command icons 54a and 54b change orientation when the control button 28 is selected indicating that the orientation of the computer 10 has changed. In other words, these command icons 54a and 54b can be maintained in an upright position around the border of the display screen 26, but do not in any way indicate "attribute information about an operation state of the screen body," as presently recited in independent claim 33 of Applicant's invention. In fact, since these command icons 54a and 54b are maintained in an upright position regardless of a change in orientation of the display screen 26, these command icons 54a and 54b do not provide any "attribute information about an operation state" of the display screen 26. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these command icons 54a and 54b shown in Register cannot be interpreted as Applicant's "OSD window," as presently recited in independent claim 33 of Applicant's invention.

Accordingly, since Register does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 33, Register cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 33 is allowable over Register, and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

C. Claims 47-48

Applicant respectfully submits that Register fails to disclose, among other things, "receiving a selection of the one or more screen function keys while the screen body is powered on and the OSD is not being displayed on the screen body" and "selectively displaying the OSD on the screen body in response to the selection of the one or more screen function keys...", as presently recited in independent claim 47.

Accordingly, since Register does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 47, Register cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that

independent claim 47 is allowable over Register, and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Regarding claim 48, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reason that claim 48 depends from independent claim 47, and therefore contains each of the features as presently recited in this claim, claim 48 is therefore also patentable over Register. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of this claim is also earnestly solicited.

D. Claim 49

Applicant respectfully submits that Register fails to disclose, among other things, "wherein the rotatable screen does not display the OSD when operating during a first time, and the rotatable screen displays the OSD when operating during a second time following the first time, the second time beginning when the selection of the one or more screen function keys is received," as presently recited in independent claim 49.

In contrast with the present invention, it is evident from FIGS. 4 and 5 of Register that the display screen 26 constantly displays the "DISPLAY SCREEN IMAGE" whenever the display screen 26 is operating. In particular, Register's display screen 26 operates by displaying the DISPLAY SCREEN IMAGE in one of two orientations according to a selection of a toggle button 34, regardless of the orientation of the display screen 26. See Register column 4, lines 10-14 and FIGS. 4-5. Consequently, Register's display screen 26 displays the DISPLAY SCREEN IMAGE any time the display screen 26 is operating, and Register's display screen 26 is not a rotatable screen that "does not display the OSD when operating during a first time... and...displays the OSD when operating during a second time following the first time..." as presently recited in independent claim 49 of Applicant's invention.

Accordingly, since Register does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 49, Register cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 49 is allowable over Register, and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

E. Claims 50-51

Applicant respectfully submits that Register fails to disclose, among other things,

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated September 25, 2006
Reply to the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006

"wherein the screen does not display the OSD when operating during a first time, and the screen displays the OSD when operating during a second time following the first time, the second time beginning when the selection of the one or more screen function keys is received," as presently recited in independent claim 50.

Accordingly, since Register does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 50, Register cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 50 is allowable over Register, and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Regarding claim 51, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reason that claim 51 depends from independent claim 50, and therefore contains each of the features as presently recited in this claim, claim 51 is therefore also patentable over Register. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of this claim is also earnestly solicited.

IV. Rejection under 35 USC §102 based on Kishimoto

Claims 34-41, 45-46, 52-53, 55-63 and 67-69 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,134,390 to Kishimoto et al. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these claims for at least the following reasons.

A. Claims 34, 61, and 67

At page 10 of the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006, the Examiner relies on "An image input unit 4, e.g., an image scanner, reads image information on a medium in the form of binary signals" as allegedly anticipating Applicant's "second image."

However, Applicant respectfully submits that the scanner 4 of Kishimoto et al. does not "receiv[e] an externally input video signal having a second image" nor does Kishimoto et al.'s scanner 4 include "an externally input video signal having a second image," as presently recited in independent claim 34. In particular, a binary image is not a "video signal," therefore, Kishimoto et al. fails to disclose, among other things, "receiving an externally input video signal having a second image" and "displaying the second image," as presently recited in independent

claim 34.

Accordingly, since Kishimoto et al. does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 34, Kishimoto et al. cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 34 is allowable over Kishimoto et al., and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Regarding claims 61, and 67, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reasons that each of claims 61, and 67 depends from independent claim 34, and therefore contain each of the features as presently recited in this claim, claims 61, and 67 are therefore also patentable over Kishimoto et al. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is also earnestly solicited.

B. Claim 35

Applicant respectfully submits that for similar reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 34, Kishimoto et al. also fails to disclose, among other things, "a converter to receive externally inputted video signals having a picture" and "a circuit unit to display the picture of the externally inputted video signals on the screen body and to display the OSD image...on the displayed picture," as presently recited in independent claim 35 of Applicant's invention.

Accordingly, since Kishimoto et al. does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 35, Kishimoto et al. cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 35 is allowable over Kishimoto et al., and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

C. Claims 36-38

At page 23 of the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006, the Examiner asserts that "since there no specific properties relating to an 'OSD window,' Examiner considers Kishimoto satisfies the claimed limitations."

However, as set forth above in the discussion of the Examiner's §112 rejection, an OSD window is clearly shown in FIGS. 1, 2, 6, 7, and 10 of Applicant's specification. For example,

the OSD 1104 shown in FIG. 10 is well known in the art to be referred to as a "window" displayed on the "SCREEN." In other words, "window" is a term of art that has its own meaning which is generally known and which is consistent with Applicant's "OSD window." Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's disregard for Applicant's "OSD window" as allegedly having "no specific properties" is improper. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not shown that Kishimoto et al. anticipates the claimed invention, as recited in independent claim 36 of Applicant's invention.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Kishimoto et al. fails to disclose "an OSD window," as recited in independent claim 36, since none of the data on the display in FIG. 6 of Kishimoto et al. can reasonably be construed as a "window." Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Kishimoto et al. also does not disclose "a control unit to generate a mode control signal to indicate a desired display position of the OSD window on the rotatable screen body," as recited in independent claim 36 of Applicant's invention.

Accordingly, since Kishimoto et al. does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element of independent claim 36, as presently recited, Kishimoto et al. cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 36 is allowable over Kishimoto et al., and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Regarding claims 37 and 38, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reasons that each of claims 37 and 38 depends from independent claim 36, and therefore contain each of the features as recited in this claim, claims 37 and 38 are therefore also patentable over Kishimoto et al. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is also earnestly solicited.

D. Claims 39, 62, and 68

Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 34, Kishimoto et al. also fails to disclose, among other things, "a converter to receive an externally inputted video signal having a second image" and "an on-screen display unit to display the first image...on the second image," as presently recited in independent claim 39 of Applicant's invention.

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated September 25, 2006
Reply to the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006

Accordingly, since Kishimoto et al. does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 39, Kishimoto et al. cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 39 is allowable over Kishimoto et al., and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Regarding claims 62 and 68, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reasons that each of claims 62 and 68 depends from independent claim 39, and therefore contain each of the features as presently recited in this claim, claims 62 and 68 are therefore also patentable over Kishimoto et al. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is also earnestly solicited.

E. Claims 40, 41, 63, and 69

Applicant respectfully submits that for similar reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 34, Kishimoto et al. also fails to disclose, among other things, "receiving an external color component video signal having a second image," as presently recited in independent claim 40 of Applicant's invention.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that any binary image produced by the scanner 4 shown in FIG. 6 of Kishimoto et al. would not be "a[n]...color component video signal," as presently recited in independent claim 40, since the scanner 4 cannot produce a color signal.

Accordingly, since Kishimoto et al. does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 40, Kishimoto et al. cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 40 is allowable over Kishimoto et al., and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Regarding claims 41, 63, and 69, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reasons that each of claims 41, 63, and 69 depends from independent claim 40, and therefore contain each of the features as recited in this claim, claims 41, 63, and 69 are therefore also patentable

over Kishimoto et al. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is also earnestly solicited.

F. Claims 45-46

With regard to independent claim 45, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the data or image shown in FIG. 6 of Kishimoto et al. can properly be interpreted as "attribute setting information about operation of the screen body," as presently recited. Specifically, neither the character information 61 nor the guidance information 62 can be read as "attribute setting information." As a result, Kishimoto et al. fails to disclose, among other things, "a circuit unit to modify the OSD image containing attribute setting information about operation of the screen body, and to selectively generate one of the OSD image and the modified OSD image according to a signal representing a rotation state of the screen body," as presently recited in independent claim 45.

Accordingly, since Kishimoto et al. does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 45, Kishimoto et al. cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 45 is allowable over Kishimoto et al., and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Regarding claim 46, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reason that claim 46 depends from independent claim 45, and therefore contains each of the features as presently recited in this claim, claim 46 is therefore also patentable over Kishimoto et al. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of this claim is also earnestly solicited.

G. Claims 52-53 and 55-56

At page 14 of the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006, the Examiner relies on the scanner 4 shown in FIG. 1 of Kishimoto et al. as allegedly being the same as Applicant's "external signal unit to receive an external image signal." However, Applicant respectfully points out that the scanner does not receive "an external image signal," as presently recited in independent claim 52 of Applicant's invention. In contrast with the present invention, the scanner 4 only produces a binary bitmap in Kishimoto et al. filing system, but does not receive any type of image signal.

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated September 25, 2006
Reply to the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006

Accordingly, Kishimoto et al. fails to disclose, among other things, "an external signal unit to receive an external image signal" and "a circuit unit to drive the display unit to display the external image signal and to drive the display unit to display the internal OSD image signal," as recited in independent claim 52 of Applicant's invention.

Furthermore, Kishimoto et al. does not disclose "an OSD generator to generate an internal OSD image signal," since the image display control unit 8, as relied on by the Examiner, does not "generate" any internal image signals.

Accordingly, since Kishimoto et al. does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element as recited in independent claim 52, Kishimoto et al. cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 52 is allowable over Kishimoto et al., and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Applicant further respectfully submits that independent claim 55 recites similar features as recited in independent claim 52, and accordingly, claim 55 is also allowable over Kishimoto et al.

Regarding claims 53 and 56, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reasons that each of claims 53 and 56 depend from independent claims 52 and 55, respectively, and therefore contain each of the features as recited in these claims, claims 53 and 56 are therefore also patentable over Kishimoto et al. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are also earnestly solicited.

H. Claims 57-60

Applicant respectfully submits that for similar reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 34, Kishimoto et al. fails to disclose, among other things, "a rotatable display unit to display an image of an external color component video signal...an OSD generator to generate an internal OSD color component video signal separate from the external color component video signal...a circuit unit to drive the display unit to display the internal OSD color component video signal on the image of the external color component video signal at a rotated position in accordance with the mode signal generated by the control unit," as presently recited in independent claim 57 of Applicant's invention.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that any binary image produced by the scanner 4 shown in FIG. 6 of Kishimoto et al. would not be "an external color component video signal" OR "an internal OSD color component video signal separate from the external color component video signal," as presently recited in independent claim 57, since the scanner 4 cannot produce a color signal, let alone a video signal.

Accordingly, since Kishimoto et al. does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 57, Kishimoto et al. cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 57 is allowable over Kishimoto et al., and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Applicant further respectfully submits that independent claim 59 recites similar features as presently recited in independent claim 57, and accordingly, claim 59 is also allowable over Kishimoto et al.

Regarding claims 58 and 60, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reasons that each of claims 58 and 60 depend from independent claims 57 and 59, respectively, and therefore contain each of the features as presently recited in these claims, claims 57 and 59 are therefore also patentable over Kishimoto et al. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are also earnestly solicited.

V. Rejection under 35 USC §102 based on Sakamoto

Claims 42 and 43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,329,289 to Sakamoto et al. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these claims for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sakamoto et al. fails to disclose, among other things, "displaying an image from an externally input video signal during first and second operating times of the display apparatus" and "selectively generating one of the OSD image and the modified OSD image according to a signal representing a rotation state of the screen body to

display the selectively generated one of the OSD image and the modified OSD image on the display apparatus during the second operating time and not the first operating time," as presently recited in independent claim 42 of Applicant's invention.

Applicant submits that claim 42 has been amended to more clearly define the invention, as recited in independent claim 42. Accordingly, since Sakamoto et al. does not explicitly or inherently disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 42, Sakamoto et al. cannot be properly used to reject independent claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 42 is allowable over Sakamoto et al., and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Regarding claim 43, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reason that claim 43 depends from independent claim 42, and therefore contains each of the features as presently recited in this claim, claim 43 is therefore also patentable over Sakamoto et al. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of this claim is also earnestly solicited.

VI. Rejection under 35 USC §103 based on Register in view of Sakamoto

Claims 30 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Register in view of Sakamoto et al. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 30 and 31 depend from independent claim 20, and therefore, include each of the features presently recited in independent claim 20. The Examiner acknowledges that Register does not disclose reading OSD data contained in the OSD image as first OSD data and modifying the first OSD data. See Final Office Action of June 6, 2006 page 19, item 48. However, the Examiner relies on Sakamoto et al. to allegedly teach or suggest the features admittedly lacking in Register. See Final Office Action of June 6, 2006 page 19, item 48. Applicant respectfully submits that even if Sakamoto et al. did describe reading OSD data contained in the OSD image..., as alleged by the Examiner, Register and Sakamoto et al., either separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "displaying a picture of externally inputted color component video signals on the screen body and displaying the OSD image on

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated September 25, 2006
Reply to the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006

the displayed picture, the OSD image containing information about operation of the screen at a rotated position in accordance with the mode signal," as presently recited in independent claim 20 of Applicant's invention.

Accordingly, claims 30 and 31 are patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner, and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

VII. Rejection under 35 USC §103 based on Sakamoto in view of Kishimoto

Claim 44 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto et al. in view of Kishimoto et al. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 44 depends from independent claim 42, and therefore, includes each of the features presently recited in independent claim 42. The Examiner acknowledges that Sakamoto et al. does not disclose reading first data corresponding to the OSD image in a predetermined manner to generate second data. See Final Office Action of June 6, 2006 page 20, item 51. However, the Examiner relies on Kishimoto et al. to allegedly teach or suggest the features admittedly lacking in Sakamoto et al. See Final Office Action of June 6, 2006 page 20, item 51. Applicant respectfully submits that even if Kishimoto et al. did describe reading first data corresponding to the OSD image in a predetermined manner to generate second data, as alleged by the Examiner, Sakamoto et al. and Kishimoto et al., either separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "displaying an image from an externally input video signal during first and second operating times of the display apparatus" and "selectively generating one of the OSD image and the modified OSD image according to a signal representing a rotation state of the screen body to display the selectively generated one of the OSD image and the modified OSD image on the display apparatus during the second operating time and not the first operating time," as presently recited in independent claim 42 of Applicant's invention.

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated September 25, 2006
Reply to the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006

Accordingly, claim 44 is patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner, and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

VIII. Rejection under 35 USC §103 based on Kishimoto in view of Register

Claims 54 and 64-66 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto et al. in view of Register. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 54 and 64-66 depend from independent claims 52, 34, 39, and 40, and therefore, include each of the features presently recited in independent claims 52, 34, 39, and 40, respectively. The Examiner acknowledges that Kishimoto et al. does not disclose a rotatable screen body having one or more function keys. See Final Office Action of June 6, 2006 page 21, item 53. However, the Examiner relies on Register to allegedly teach or suggest the features admittedly lacking in Kishimoto et al. See Final Office Action of June 6, 2006 page 21, item 53. Applicant respectfully submits that even if Register did describe a rotatable screen body having one or more function keys, as alleged by the Examiner, Kishimoto et al. and Register, either separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "an external signal unit to receive an external image signal" and "a circuit unit to drive the display unit to display the external image signal and to drive the display unit to display the internal OSD image signal," as recited in independent claim 52 of Applicant's invention. Accordingly, claim 55 is patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner, and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Furthermore, Kishimoto et al. and Register, either separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "receiving an externally input video signal having a second image" and "displaying the second image," as presently recited in independent claim 34; "a converter to receive an externally inputted video signal having a second image" and "an on-screen display unit to display the first image...on the second image," as presently recited in independent claim 39 of Applicant's invention; and "receiving an external color component video signal having a second image," as presently recited in independent claim 40 of Applicant's invention.

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated September 25, 2006
Reply to the Final Office Action of June 6, 2006

Accordingly, claims 64-66 are patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner, and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of these claims are also earnestly solicited.

IX. Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If any fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: 9/25/2006
919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901

By: 
Patrick Stanzone
Registration No. 40,434